DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 507 CS 213 623

AUTHOR Walker, Kenneth H.
TITLE The Wordsmith in Academe: Publications Editing for Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 58p.; Published by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Publications Office.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Editing; *Editors; *Higher Education; Proofreading; *Publishing Industry; *Scholarly Journals; *School Publications; Writing for Publication
IDENTIFIERS Academic Discourse; *Editor Role; Professional Concerns; Text Factors

ABSTRACT

This manual deals with publications editing for institutions of higher education. The manual is addressed to editors both experienced and inexperienced, and to those interested in the field of editing. Included in the manual are the following eight chapters: (1) Mighty Are the Preparations; (2) Context First, Text Later; (3) Coworkers; (4) Approaches; (5) Unspoken Assumptions; (6) The Acts of Editing; (7) Overload and How To Avoid It; and (8) Nuts and Bolts. An appendix, containing "Helpful Books" and "A Letter That Could Be Better," is attached. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354507

CS

The Wordsmith in Academe

Publications Editing for Colleges and Universities

by

Kenneth H. Walker

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daniel M. Melley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS213623

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Wordsmith in Academe

Publications Editing for Colleges and Universities

by

Kenneth H. Walker

Published by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Publications Office

© 1991 by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Poetry © 1991 by Kenneth H. Walker

All rights reserved

Designed by Jim Burke

Printed in the United States of America

Preface

This manual grew out of the author's unsuccessful search for such a work over a period of 40 years. It is written in the hope that it may save other editors from leafing through a number of other reference books and manuals in the search for the fragments of editorial advice and philosophy it contains.

Workbooks and manuals on editing are plentiful, and many of them contain better counsel on some aspects of the craft than will be found here. Nevertheless, most fall short of covering the entire scope of editing for institutions of higher education, especially the public universities and colleges, or of providing a focus on such work.

In its attempt to provide all things to all such editors, this manual will undoubtedly fall short, and may appear too opinionated or subjective to some and too basic to others. But if it offers any assistance not found elsewhere, it will have served its purpose.

The author's interest in editing was born while a copyboy on the *Boston Globe*, was tested during a decade on the *Greenfield Recorder*, and was allowed to grow without restraint during a quarter-century as University Editor at the University of Massachusetts.❦

(From Walker's Highly Abridged Dictionary)

EDITOR (ed́-i-ter), n. (L.), 1. One who edits, or alters another's writing. 2. A high priest of prose; a saviour to the uncertain and an arch-fiend to the self-satisfied. 3. The final repository of blame for a publication's textual faults. 4. A gadfly, hair-splitter, magician, intermittent ghost-writer, pedant, interpreter, and egotist. 5. One who, unlike a writer, is excused from the necessity of beginning anything.

Contents

Introduction 2

Chapter I Mighty Are the Preparations 3

Less Is More 5

Chapter II Context First, Text Later 6

Note to the Editor from a Scholarly Author 9

Chapter III Coworkers 10

The Heavy Edit 13

Chapter IV Approaches 14

The Admirable Failure 18

Chapter V Unspoken Assumptions 19

The Urge to Modify 22

Chapter VI The Acts of Editing 23

How Deep the Roots 31

Chapter VII Overload and How to Avoid It 32

Things the Editor Does Not Wish to Hear 35

Chapter VIII Nuts and Bolts 36

Appendix

I Helpful Books 48

II A Letter That Could Be Better 50

Introduction

By the author's definition, publications editing is the act of altering written material before printing in an attempt to improve its effectiveness. This leads directly to the reason for editing: in order to make a printed piece more potent.

The potency of a piece is made up of its potential plus professional writing, editing, design, production, and distribution. All these factors, properly considered and pursued, result in an effective publication, be it simple or highly complex.

Cost-effectiveness is a popular concept. Equally important is the idea that the two parts of the concept are not necessarily related in any way: it is perfectly easy to turn out a highly effective piece at low cost, and equally easy to produce an expensive piece which will not be read.

Design leads a reader into a printed piece as a horse can be led to water. It is the editor's skill which determines whether the reader will find the proffered substance clear, free of impurities, and deeply satisfying.

Don't expect to find everything you need in this book. Even *War and Peace* falls short of demonstrating all possible aspects of writing fiction, and that craft is far less rigid than editing.

More than 2,000 years ago the Biblical preacher complained that "of the making of books there is no end," and their rate of production has certainly increased since then. But editors and would-be editors should feel only gratitude for this situation, because it allows them to fill a shelf or two with reference works which could be helpful as they continue to hone their skills. No one was ever able to remember as much as it is possible to look up.

A list of books covering many aspects of editing which I have either intentionally omitted or forgotten to mention is included here as a bibliography. Most of the listed books touch on the basics of language, voice, style, grammar, and — most importantly — writing. These are areas which this manual does not attempt to cover, as they are not editorial functions in the strict sense. Nevertheless, editing without their use as a foundation is impossible.

This manual is addressed to editors both experienced and inexperienced, to prospective editors, and to those who want or need to know what it is that editors are doing and why. It will be successful to the extent that it saves time, effort, and money — not to mention psychic pain — as editors hasten along the endless treadmill toward perfection.❦

Chapter I

Mighty Are the Preparations

Editing, even for institutions of higher education, is a lot like aerial acrobatics — it's more or less spectacular depending on your personal perspective, and it can't be done without practice, confidence, and first getting considerable dead weight off the ground.

Practice involves doing, and confidence comes with repeated successes in practicing the editorial craft. The not-so-successful episodes are at best instructive, and at worst (unlike aeronautics) are not fatal. Getting airborne, however, must be accomplished over and over, before each editing episode.

Preparation for editing requires more than the editor; it involves the institution by which the editor is employed, the editor's client (here synonymous with author), and the intended readership. Each of these four components has its own viewpoint and opinion, its own requirements, and its own definition of a successful outcome. The editing process, if it is to succeed, must make an honest attempt to satisfy all four perspectives. It is in this attempt that the notion of dead weight may arise.

Preparing the editor means cultivating an open mind on every aspect of a given project which can involve choices without breaking faith with acceptable editorial practice. It means consideration of all legitimate options, not solely the first option to occur to the editorial mind, or the editor's personal favorite among the options.

Preparation in light of institutional requirements and philosophy is a vague but sensitive area. Keeping a watchful eye on the institution's superficial editorial requirements is relatively simple: how the institutional name shall be used, inclusion of mandated codes indicating date and quantity printed, insertion of mandated items such as an affirmative action statement, and so forth. More difficult is the task of sensing how the tone or approach or thrust of a particular document will mesh or conflict with the institution's current development stance, academic initiatives, admissions posture, or political realities. These are far tougher; not only is it hard to align honest editorial work with these factors, but more often than not they are matters on which institutional administrators fail to communicate to editors.

Preparing to edit with an eye to a specific client or author brings to mind the first precept given novices at magicians' school — Know Your Rabbit. No one will allow you with good grace to pull them from an editorial hat if they

do not trust your skill and feel your sympathy. What is the author's unwritten intent? What does the author foresee in the way of outcomes? To whom does the author believe the message is addressed? What does the author wish the reader to do when the reading is over? The list of vital questions sometimes seems endless, and — most difficult of all — they should be asked before the initial writing takes place.

Preparation with regard to the intended readership means knowing as much about this aspect as about your institution and the author. Is the particular readership envisioned by the author really that to whom the printed piece will actually find its way and by whom it will be read? Is the style, tone, and readability of the piece likely to be accepted by the specific readership? Does the author have any real grasp of who the intended readers are, or is the publication aimed at "everybody" — a synonym for nobody in particular? How much of the content does the readership already know, and hence would prove at least slightly irritating if repeated?

In a broader sense, preparation for editing begins with the acquisition of a vocabulary of both breadth and depth, in conjunction with a broad — and not so deep as to interfere with the breadth — communication-based education. Here, communication means any method by which ideas are transferred, rather than referring solely to language, the media, rhetoric, sign language, or other specific slice of the grand communication pie.

The vocabulary and its effective employment come with vast quantities of reading of work by skilled writers, a project which can never begin too early. Those who do not love language for its own wondrous intricacies and variety would do well not to rely on editing for their livelihood.

Another exercise of value to many editors is writing. This may sound simplistic, but brings several benefits. First, editors who do not know how difficult it is to write clear, concise, and effective prose may not be properly sympathetic to the authors whose efforts come before them. Second, the editor's own attempt at writing will resolve the persistent question of whether the editor should attempt extensive rewriting or simply encourage the author to do so, when such a cure appears needed. And third, an editor's own writing efforts — regardless of their relative success —will keep sharply in the editorial mind the often neglected fact that editing and writing, although unquestionably related, are only kissing cousins, and not identical twins performing different tasks.

Editing is not writing, not even writing of a specialized sort. Few individuals can edit their own writing well. Writers who edit themselves are as commonplace and as sensible as surgeons who perform self-administered appendectomies. This is not to say that it has never been done, only that it may be best to leave the matter to other hands.❦

Less Is More

Wordsmith, sing a song of brevity,
Surpassing tragedy and levity.

The verb of greatest benefit
To florid prose is "to omit."

Make it short and crisp and neat.
Compress. Keep simple. Cut. Delete.

— *K. H. W.*

Chapter II

Context First, Text Later

Before touching a text, any editor would do well to be sure of the context. What are the unwritten — and possibly unconsidered — assumptions surrounding the project?

Most editors know in advance the answers to the basic questions, such as: Will I be paid for this? When do they need it? Who is publishing it? Who has borrowed my keyboard?

Many times, however, equally important questions are either left unanswered or unasked. For example:

Who's in charge here?

The answer here involves the organizational structure of the employing institution in general, but more specifically will determine just who will be the final authority over the words in question. Is the individual who first discusses the project with you going to write the copy? Does anyone think *you* are going to write it? Who will approve the edited manuscript before typeset or scanning or transfer from disc, the contact person, a committee, or a department head? Who will you approach if disagreement persists between editor and author/contact after the first attempt at compromise? Does the material in question involve the reader's perception of a program, a department, or the entire institution, and how should this affect copy control and final approval?

In many instances, it is best if the editor is in charge — not of the meaning of the content or its veracity, but of its style, tone, voice, structure, and "fit" with institutional objectives and approach to them. Regarding such matters, authors defer readily to editors if they believe the changes suggested are in their best interests as members of a larger community — another way of saying that disregarding the editor's suggestions could result in anything from public ridicule to displeasure on the part of the author's superiors.

Another important question bearing on context rather than content is:

Should this be a publication, or something else?

Before too many years of editing have gone by, it becomes impossible to count the number of occasions on which the editor has been approached with a draft for a publication by an author or client who has simply been told to

prepare a publication, without even a vague reason for doing so, other than the fact that some feeling exists that public exposure would be beneficial.

If no one else has done it, and it appears to need to be done, it is the editor's responsibility to point out to the requestor that perhaps something other than a publication is called for, such as a telephone call to 87 specific individuals, a carefully personalized form letter to a specific mailing list, a video spot announcement, a series of local radio announcements, or even a personal appearance by the institution's president before one or more public groups. A publication is sometimes the simplistic answer to a complex need, and may be the wrong answer.

How do you know if a publication is the right approach? By asking other questions, such as: What is the likelihood that the intended readership will be receptive to the planned piece, based on what is reasonable to assume about them or what can be learned with a little effort? Does the requesting unit have a reasonable plan for getting the piece into the hands of the readership, such as a focused mailing list or prior agreement on the part of another agency to distribute it? Is there a better medium for reaching the intended consumers of the information?

Reduced to its essentials, the most vital query to be pursued in detail with each requestor of a publication is this:

What do you want it to do to whom?

This simple question includes the whole area of purpose and the response desired from the intended readership, as well as a working knowledge of just who comprises that readership. Even if the editor is not the individual who asks these questions, the editor cannot function professionally without the answers.

Other questions which are likely to be posed by someone other than the editor involve timing and money — a whole series of deadlines leading to receipt of the finished material, working backward from desired date of distribution, and a firm commitment of the funds needed to turn the concept into reality. Blessed is the editor who works with a production manager who takes care of all such mundane matters.

Another valuable question, which can save time and avoid misunderstanding, is this:

Do you have a sample of the same publication from the past or a similar publication that you like?

If such a specimen is available, whether printed at your own institution or elsewhere, it provides a basis for discussion of the scope of content, the order of presentation of the ideas, the style and tone of writing, the level of

detail, and any imbedded assumptions about the readership which the printed piece contains. It is the editor's job to make sure the client/author of the proposed publication can divorce these aspects from such non-editorial matters as the paper stock, colors of ink, illustrations, typeface, and all other design elements.

Ideas to be pursued if an approved sample is shown include whether the readership in the present instance is identical, and if not how it differs; what there is about the sample that the client feels especially effective and what aspects of it might be improved; and whether it represents the basis for a strict reprint (in which case the editor may have to suggest that certain updating is required), a slight or substantial revision, or an entirely new text.

Further, editors should make sure of any editorial implications hidden in the production details, such as quantity and timing, by asking:

How many months or years will the requested quantity last, and when will it first be read?

If the number of copies to be ordered will last two years, editors should look for references in the manuscript to such ideas as "last year" or "for the past three years," and change them accordingly to the year date itself or "recently" or any similar legitimate evasion of the problem. In the same way, if a publication is edited in February, and because of the time required for production and distribution will be read for the first time in June, it is the editor's responsibility to alter any use of the future tense relating to the intervening months, or specific past tense references which will be out of joint at the time the readers first meet the printed words. All writing should be in a time frame based on consumption by the readership, and this time frame must be broadened as well as future-based if the publication will be in use for an extended period of time.

Finally, the question of selective memories:

Will everyone involved in setting up the context for this publication remember the preliminary agreements in the same way?

Not likely. Not unless all aspects are down on paper, and the paper is shared with all concerned. The usual answer is the use of forms, and the less formal "memo of understanding" by which important matters — all those things which would cause trouble later if not uniformly adhered to — are set down in writing and provided to all planning participants. This method tends to firm up such things as draft manuscript deadlines and approval turnaround times.❦

14

Note to the Editor from a Scholarly Author

What though I welcomed no assistance
And met suggestions with resistance?
What though the jargon of my field,
When faced with change, refused to yield?
What though the prose incites to slumber
And readers in substantial number
Suggest I take the piece and shove it?
Never mind. My colleagues love it.

— *K. H. W.*

Chapter III

Coworkers

Editing may sometimes seem to be a solitary occupation, but it is not. It is an intensely interpersonal act. Other minds are invariably involved, and must be understood and communicated with.

Who are the usual cast of characters? The requestor, the author, the client, the editor, the designer, the production manager, the typesetter or keyboarder, the proofreader, the clerical staff, the printer, and the reader. There may be others; some of those named may wear two of the listed hats. In any event, they each have different concerns and perspectives on the work in hand, and must bring these together in order to make any project successful.

The requestor is often the client and also may be the author of the original draft manuscript. They may also be three separate individuals, and if so must share a common concept of the proposed publication and its purpose if the editor is to be allowed to assist them. In the best of worlds, these individuals meet and collude on their own; in the worst scenario, the editor must bring them — or at least their ideas — together. The most difficult task may be determining whether agreement among these individuals does in fact exist.

Next, the editor and author must work together in shaping the final text. This can be simple if the text is well written in the first instance or if the author has come to trust the editor's judgment; it can be heavy going if the author must be convinced to make massive changes or if the author believes the first draft is sacred writ, whatever alteration may be suggested.

Given an approved edited manuscript, the designer and editor should consult on the approach best suited to the impact desired. This is not to say that either must intrude in the other's preserve: both should be aware that what is *said* begins for a designer with the editor, and how it will *appear* begins for an editor with the designer. Nevertheless, each can be of assistance to the other, and should do so for the best outcome. They should be to text and appearance as Gilbert and Sullivan were to words and music — working through sometimes conflicting concepts to a publicly acclaimed product.

The production manager works with the editor to maintain schedules. Editors should know in advance what timeframe has been established for each successive step in the process; by the same token editors must do their part to defend and maintain the schedule, doing battle with authors and authors' bosses and with their own passion for procrastination.

Clients who take edited manuscripts away from the publications office in order to "think about it" or to have someone else decide what editorial suggestions are acceptable are attempting to borrow trouble, and if they cannot be restrained should at least be informed immediately of the consequences of unforeseen delay, including both the loss of time (which could derail a printing schedule completely) and the extra expense involved.

The editor and production manager should agree in advance which of them will make these things clear to the client. The alternative may be that neither or both do so, and it is difficult to decide which would be worse.

Proofreaders may be found among the clerical staff in many publications offices, and if not found may be created for the purpose of the moment. Professional proofreaders are an enviable luxury for most institutions; the minimum requirement is for someone on the staff to read the edited manuscript aloud (including punctuation, paragraphing, indents, italics, capitalization, and spelling of proper names and uncommon words) while the editor follows along on the typeset material. Solo proofreading is not only slower, but invites errors to become permanent residents.

Personal conventions in proofing, such as voice inflections for specific punctuation, use of verbal abbreviations, and the like, are worked out between the individuals performing the task. All proofed pages or galleys should be initialed.

Clerical staff often interact with editors in record keeping and in maintaining the flow of materials within the office. Regardless of whose responsibility it is, time and expense records must be kept, movement of materials between employees must be logged, and a central point person must be available to inform clients of the current status of their jobs. Thus the editor who does not keep these postings or data entries up to date personally must communicate frequently with those who do. Whatever the system, all concerned should understand it and help it to succeed. The only troublesome or difficult system is one which is not universally adhered to.

The extent of contact between editors and printers is worked out with the production manager in most publications offices. It is not often required, except for formal indication of proof approval or needed alterations.

The reader is the other half of the holy union for which the editor has served as marriage broker. The editor is successful only to the extent to which the client-author has been accepted into the mind of the reader. Editors usually know whether they have brought author and reader together; if they have doubts, informal or formal readership surveys are in order.

Readership surveys range from a few conversations with trusted colleagues who happen to have read the printed piece, to formal surveys designed by professional opinion samplers. In any case, the scope of the survey is determined by the kinds of feedback desired and whether it needs to be both emotionally satisfying and statistically significant.

Whatever the project, the ideas, methods, needs, and sensibilities of each of the foregoing people or categories of people — as well as the objectives and spirit of the institution concerned — must be considered. Any editing done without such consideration is a waste of time.❦

The Heavy Edit

The Provost felt a new brochure
    Would give the College fresh allure.
The Faculty Committee sat,
    Churned out a draft, and that was that.
The Dean admitted, to his credit,
    "It's going to need a heavy edit."
The Editor agreed. The text
    Was one great horror. Unperplexed,
The Editor began to work,
    Slashing deftly through the murk.
Out went the claims that seemed pure lies,
    The modifiers dropped like flies;
The cliches vanished with the bland,
    The dull was banished out of hand;
The periphrastic, otiose,
    And passive fled with the verbose.
The work complete, cured of its ills,
    The fresh brochure stood free of frills.
The Editor received no thanks.
    The printed pages were all blanks.

—*K. H. W.*

Chapter IV

Approaches

Publications are a lot like automobiles — in order for them to run smoothly along to the intended destination, they must be well planned and designed. Any small problem in the works can make them stall and sputter, or die along the road.

As vehicles of communication, publications need editors in the same way as cars need mechanics — to take them for a test drive, if only in the mind, and to try to work all the bugs out before the owners take them on important trips. Both the auto service shop and the editorial office deal in both simple and complex mechanics, as well as in diagnosis of hidden ills, acts which may seem magical to the customer.

In approaching both car care and editing, one of the most vital ingredients is customer confidence. This is achieved by several methods, but the best is conversation. What is the problem or need? What are all the institutional, departmental, academic, professional, and personal details which will have an impact on the publication?

Once the editor feels an understanding of the client's approach to the publication, it is vital that the client feel the same regarding the editor's approach. Confidence requires the editor to spell out what will be done to the draft manuscript, how long it may take, the manner in which client approval will be sought for suggested changes, and what if any aspects of the wording will be non-negotiable.

Clients should be made keenly aware of the progressive worsening of the climate for revision over time — that now is cheap and later is expensive, in both time, money, and perhaps even in emotion. What is done to a manuscript before an editor sees it costs nothing. Changes prior to client approval of the edited manuscript are relatively cost-free. Changes on type-set galleys or hard copy from computer disk involve some expense, whether internal or external. Changes after page proof, mechanicals, or even on final salt print can make costs leap unpleasantly, or even exponentially.

Remember, we're not talking simply money here, a topic outside the concerns of some editors. We're talking time, psychic pain, and possibly even having to do the same work more than once. Why do anything the hard way when a little preplanning will make it simpler, shorter, saner, or all three?

Much of the work of preplanning is eliminated if the publications office has a printed publications guide, spelling out the office's services and requirements. These are generally made available to all major campus units or handed to clients at first contact. Even with this device in place, a face-to-face chat on the same topics is a good idea. A small percentage of individuals receiving such a guide never bother to read it.

If there is no publications guide, or if you suspect a client may need a booster shot of the information your guide contains, a bit of mnemonic alliteration could be helpful, passed on to the client informally, in writing or verbally, in a format such as the following:

> More difficulty is encountered in publications work because ideas are not considered in an effective time-frame and order than for any other reason. By following the sequence outlined below, you can make publications work relatively trouble-free.
>
> •CONSIDER what you want in the publication — your needs, those of your unit, those of your readership —, how you will distribute the publication, and what effect you expect it to have.
>
> •CONSULT with the professionals in your publications office on those topics, and on format, illustrations, timeframe, costs, etc.
>
> •COMPILE a first-draft manuscript, including everything to appear in type, such as cover and spine wording, internal title and headings, and return address.
>
> •COLLABORATE with the assigned editor, designer, and production manager as your job progresses through the many stages required.

What these stages are will depend to some extent on policies and methods unique to your own institution. A series of generally accepted steps follow:

— Client requests publication, with any required budget authority and administrative approval already received.

— Client and publications office staff confer on feasibility and specifics.

— Draft manuscript typed by client.

— Draft manuscript edited in publications office.

— Client responds to editorial suggestions for change.

— Editor and client agree on final manuscript.

— Designer receives manuscript and prepares preliminary design.

— Client and designer work out final design.

— Manuscript incorporating type specifications to fit approved design goes to typeset (or computer copy is reformatted to comply).

— Client and publications staff check first type image (whether typeset or printout) and make corrections.

— Second proofs or page proofs, if needed, checked by publications staff and client.

— Reproducible proofs pasted up in final position as mechanicals, and approved by editor, designer, production manager, and client.

— Printer prepares salt print or other final proof for approval by all of the above individuals.

— Job is printed, delivered, distributed, and assessed for effectiveness.

While it may appear at first glance that many of the steps shown above do not involve editing, experience has shown that for the most effective publications they do. Editorial considerations continue to enhance or afflict any publication (depending on your viewpoint) as it passes through the stages from conception to history. This does not mean an editor's ideas on all topics must be accepted by others on the staff; it means that their insertion into the process at all stages should be automatic, in order to avoid later and possibly unpleasant surprises.

The approach for a publications editor must always be primarily from the standpoint of the readership and the publication itself — working backward, in a manner of speaking. The entire purpose of the job in hand always relates more to the interaction between the printed piece and the reader than to anything else.

The publication itself is the communicator, traveling on its own solitary journey. No editor or author is likely to be on hand to help explain anything when the publication and reader meet. Therefore an editor must envision that

meeting as completely and as realistically as is humanly possible, and base all editorial work squarely thereupon.

This approach can lead to crucial disagreement between editors and authors who are writing for themselves or their colleagues rather than for their true readership, but such disagreement is valuable indeed. Try to help such authors imagine the effect, for instance, of convoluted academese replete with jargon on the mind of a bright high school junior seeking early admission to a major in the author's discipline.

Do not expect a person whose only recent writing has been a doctoral dissertation and twenty articles in scholarly journals to be able to dash off print messages to more than one readership without assistance. The editor's task is to determine what help is needed, and to bring the author around to wanting it. Providing the help is simple by comparison.❦

The Admirable Failure

I saw your new brochure the other day.
(What office did the darn thing, anyway?)
What punch! What razzle-dazzle! What allure!
(Regarding content, I'm a bit unsure.)
The photos would impress the most myopic.
(Why can't I call to mind the theme or topic?)
I loved the paper and the typeface dearly.
(I can't recall the purpose very clearly.)
The cover surely was a pretty red.
(I hope he doesn't ask me what it said.)
That piece will win a major prize, I bet.
(It's just the subject matter I forget.)

— *K. H. W.*

Chapter V

Unspoken Assumptions

What we don't know can certainly hurt us; in fact, it is very likely to do so. A frequent stumbling block to successful editing, particularly in academia, is the crucial unspoken assumption an author/client may make concerning editors and editing.

Few people like going to doctors, and even fewer welcome professional contact with surgeons. What overcomes this reluctance may range from dislike of pain to fear of death, as well as the expectation of being helped.

Authors will not die if they do not seek the help of editors, although their work may. Nonetheless, they are not usually driven to the editor's office by positive emotions. They usually come, whether readily or reluctantly, in the fear that they may have overlooked something in their manuscripts which will not reflect credit upon them.

Thus, editors do well to consider their clients in need of reassurance, nurture, and positive reinforcement. The manuscript may need to be hacked until it bleeds and reshaped until its own parent may not recognize it, but the clients themselves should never feel they are undergoing such treatment.

Editors who exhibit sensitivity and sympathy to authors are much more likely to have their editorial changes accepted in good grace than those who cannot distinguish between the creator and the created. Reword the message, yes, but do not shed the messenger's blood in the process.

After all, what is the unspoken idea to which all editors are subjected? It is this most unpleasant notion: *By making any change whatsoever, the editor is telling the author, "I'm smarter than you are. You did this wrong, and I can make it right."*

That's not very nice, and should not be allowed to stand unchallenged, no matter how deep in the subconscious it lies. The reality is more pleasant: *We all need a second mind to show us our blind spots, and to offer a different perspective. Most editorial changes are not error correction, but suggested ways to make the good better and the great even more so.*

How does an author come to believe an unknown editor will be helpful to any work? By personal contact and conversation. Face to face is far the best, but the telephone has been known to suffice. Memos seldom do, and a deathly silence until the editorially revised manuscript shows up to speak for itself is the worst method of all.

The unspoken assumption on the part of the author may well be that the writing does not need editing, that what is on the paper is exactly what needed to be said, and that it is perfect as it stands. If this is so, the editor's task is what may be called improving perfection.

In order to be palatable, editorial changes other than finding errors in spelling and punctuation must be viewed by both editor and client as *suggestions*. Question marks beside substantive editorial suggestions meant for an author's eye are a form of simple politeness.

By whatever means, authors should be encouraged to view editorial suggestions as *options*, and the broader the choice the better. Often there is only one satisfactory replacement word in the editor's mind, or one illuminating transposition of wording, but if there is more than one alternative which is reasonable and beneficial to the text the editor is well advised to pass them all along and let the author choose among them.

This idea of *choice* is important, simply because many editorial alterations will lie outside the realm of choice in that they correct errors or restore the author's intent or provide self-evident ways out of textual trouble. A sense of balance is achieved by offering real choices as well as the devastating feeling of "How could I have missed that?" or "Why didn't I think of that?"

However it is accomplished, the editor must become in the author's view a silent partner, equally dedicated to the aims of the publication as is the author. The sense of partnership is important, but the idea of silence may be even more so. It is reassuring to realize that whatever faults the editor may have discovered, they will never be known by a later reader. Most high priests of prose have their own sense of sanctity, looking upon all original manuscripts as a type of confession of sins which can be wiped away and need go no further.

Authors who come to editorial conferences with almost visible chips on their creative shoulders are sometimes made cooperative by the simple expedient of showing them their worst manuscript problem first. This is not as harsh as it may sound, as it should be done in the kindest and most low-key manner possible. Nevertheless, being shown one word or phrase which if allowed to remain would have seriously damaged the author's intent or credibility has a healthy effect on the climate for cooperation. Wading through a mass of minute and possibly moot editorial flyspecks before getting to the nightmare can harden an author's heart unnecessarily against change, and make the editor's greatest instance of assistance lose its general persuasive power.

Editors, on the other hand, should not try to show off to authors, nor take time detailing the self-evident. Those matters which need discussion in order to reach resolution should be discussed; those which are patently acceptable the author should be permitted to peruse in silence.

The essential fuel which powers the cooperative effort between author and editor is the mutual conviction that each is focused on, and committed to, the publication and its effectiveness. Because of this, editors should take every opportunity to state *why* they have suggested particular changes in the text, explaining if necessary how the alteration will sharpen the message or heighten its impact.❦

The Urge to Modify

As editors we do decry
The writer's urge to modify.
No noun is safe. A howling pack
Of adjectives are on its track.
For each two used in telling ways,
A hundred others spawn cliches.
If banned forever, who would miss
The sight of "*special* emphasis"?
If "*final* deadline" means a thing,
What urgency can "deadline" bring?
So, editor, take up the pen;
Have at them now, and then again.
The hapless manuscript requires
Restraint of useless modifiers.

— *K. H. W.*

Chapter VI

The Acts of Editing

Manuscript editing, with all its comedy, tragedy, and intense preparation for public presentation, is a drama in four acts: First reading, or cutting your way through the underbrush; making suggested changes, or dealing with the indigenous population; assessing your own work in context, or shaping the entire social structure, and selling your changes to the client/author, or being anointed Associate to the Chief of Expression.

The last act mentioned above was dealt with in the preceding chapter. It's always pleasant to begin with a happy ending and do a flashback to the gauntlets and gore.

First reading is a wary trip through unfamiliar jungles, and it is best that this is so. If you already know a great deal about the project in hand, which in many ways is helpful, try to forget it during first reading. The perceptive eye is the cautious and suspicious eye, which assumes a gaffe or gaucherie or worse may be lurking behind every indent, within each misty metaphor, or downstairs in the spooky subliminals.

Some editors cannot restrain their hands during the first reading, and find that the pen or blue pencil has assumed a life of its own and is busily marking up the copy while the editorial mind is getting its first grip on it. This is not wrong; it is only difficult. Exceptional editors find no problem in doubling up the first and second editorial acts into a single reconnaissance and attack operation. Most, however, find it more effective to keep the two apart, and fewer injuries are usually sustained.

What is the editor looking for on first reading, other than an understanding of the manuscript's meaning? This depends on the individual. Some combine the acts of substantive assessment with copy editing — juggling at once such ideas as concept, transition, style, tone, consistency, and impact with equal regard to spelling, grammar, word choice, and clarity. Most editors find that even if they could keep all these ideas in mind at once, such a bravura juggling act is both tiring and unnecessary.

Some editors, especially if the manuscript is short, allow themselves the luxury of reading through it once for each of the approaches listed above. Most come with time to adopt a system which incorporates two or three of these rubrics for each of several passes over the territory. The approach is a

personal one, to be based over time on pragmatic results. There is no right or wrong way, only an effective or ineffective result.

Assuming the editor takes one act at a time, what are the usual areas of scrutiny on first reading? First, content and structure, always viewed with an eye to the intended impact on the selected readership.

Content includes everything stated in a manuscript. Is it complete, or are there other facts or statements which might be added to good effect? Are there notable omissions? Does it leave the reader puzzled? Is the content too extensive, approaching overkill? Are there words, paragraphs, or sections which fail to add meaning or power?

Structure involves the arrangement of the content. This is often the greatest difficulty for a writer, and thus presents one of the greatest challenges to an editor. The order in which thoughts are presented to a reader is often more important than the subtleties of the thoughts themselves.

If the writer has approached the key idea tentatively, or in a roundabout way, or by slogging through relatively inconsequential details, it is up to the editor to alter the approach. Something the reader will meet in the first minute with the finished publication should clearly state or at least tantalizingly hint at the core of the message. This something need not be the first paragraph of text, of course; it can be the title, subtitles, illustrations, or any other interest provoking device worked out among editor, designer, and client. For the present discussion, however, let us assume that only the text is being considered.

Once the reader has been faced with the core idea or a key idea on the path toward the core, the element of structure includes the progression from the initial thought through comprehension to conviction to action. Stated another way, most manuscripts progress from encouraging a reader response of "What?" to "I hear you" to "I believe it" to "I'll do it." Some purely informative publications stop with the first three, and do not intend to encourage immediate action.

Structure also includes whether or not an introduction or summary is needed; whether there are to be such scholarly or semischolarly items as table of contents, index, notes, bibliography, charts, graphs, line drawings, photographs, captions, sidebars, and any number of other assets or liabilities to effect. If a summary is desired, should it be the first item or the last or both?

Equally, structure has to do with the flow of ideas, with the linkage of the chain of meaning, with an acceptable sense of continuity. It has to do with the transitions between ideas, the often missing fragments which some journeyman editors call the mortar between the bricks.

Beads with no string make a poor necklace. Something has to hold the ideas in a certain order and pattern. If the author has not provided the string, or if it is frayed or broken, the editor must provide the remedy.

Often an author will have the continuity clearly in mind, but fail to have it appear on paper — an instance of being too familiar with the material. Vital steps in the thought process must be restored, or the reader will go astray.

The proper order in which a manuscript's ideas should be presented is the most effective order, not the most expected one. High on the list of damaging but expected orderings, which ought to raise the hackles on any editor, are the chronological and the reverse size progression. Both are common pests in many writers' gardens.

The chronological order causes its adherents to place history before immanence and desired outcomes, usually hurting both the impact of a publication and the reader's acceptance level. Many fine books start with "In the beginning" or "Once upon a time," but they are not usually the kind published by a college or university publications office.

How many times do apparently decent brochures begin "Founded in 1899 by a group of far-sighted clerics, Colloidial College has grown from an institution of three professors and twenty-seven students to . . ." Can we afford to wait even three lines to find out what Colloidial is today and what we should do about it?

Brief histories are fine, but should be placed after the core message of a piece, not before. By the same token, a chronological recitation of how a particular faculty unit grew or what preparations have been made for a development campaign should never be placed before information telling what that faculty unit is doing now, or plans to do, or before the message that a development campaign has begun and that the reader might wish to participate in it.

Unless a writer is intentionally playing games with the reader, the editor should see to it that the most important idea in a publication is up front, or on top, or first in line for show-and-tell. Who has not been irritated in conversation by the friend who first tells of getting a telephone call, then says it was from their boss, and then recaps their work history, and perhaps finally reveals that the call related to their promotion or pink-slippage? You would have to be fond of the friend's voice or be partial to long conversations to find such an approach pleasant.

In brief, chronology can blunt thought and drive readers up walls. Use it sparingly.

Reverse size progression, the other manuscript virus mentioned earlier, has to do with working toward the core message from its larger surroundings to the center. This is seldom a bright idea. It accomplishes much the same result as chronological order can.

For example, consider the departmental brochure — not a rarity, unfortunately — which begins after the cover wording with a page or two about Old Colloidial and its pleasant surroundings, followed perhaps by an informative section on the School of Humanities and its place in the College, in turn perhaps followed by a pithy presentation on the Department of Communication (which of course lies within the School which lies within the College), followed at last, most likely on page six or seven, by words devoted to the new Program in Television Production Technique which is the heart of the message and which was of course duly mentioned on the cover.

Such a progression may occur naturally to the scholarly mind, but may be counter-productive to the reader. Editors should try to sway authors' opinions on such matters.

After content and structure, what might an editor consider during first reading of a manuscript? A good candidate for scrutiny at this stage is style.

Style is easy to recognize and hard to define. It is the sense of an individual writing pattern which gives the author a particular voice in the reader's mind. It is not being stylish or unorthodox; it is the underlying emotion and character of the writer as it influences the words, their arrangement, and their pace.

Different styles might be characterized as formal or informal, hard-hitting or laid back, old-fashioned or modern, active or passive (not only the verbs and voice), radical or conservative, personal or generalized, and in many other ways. However they are dissected, styles are a reflection of writers' personalities, or if the writer is fortunate enough to possess multiple personalities, a reflection of the writer's intent.

Whatever the style of writing, it should be appropriate to the intent of the publication and its readership, and it should be consistent throughout the whole unless a jarring effect is required. Consistency as a general virtue will be discussed later.

Appropriate to the publication's intent means that a folksy style does not suit a memorial announcement, nor does an academic style suit a football program. Finer shades of gray bedevil stylistically sensitive editors everywhere.

Tone is another slippery item, hard to define and a bit elusive. When it's right, it's invisible; when it's wrong, it's devastatingly apparent. Some editors look on tone as an aspect of style; others say it belongs more to voice —what sort of personality shines through the writing. It can range from stolid to snappy, from high-flown to folksy, from general to intimate, from earnest to flippant, and in fact from any recognizable personality trait to its opposite. Which ones are right should be determined, as should almost everything else about a manuscript, by the acceptance potential of the intended readership.

Note here that reader acceptance does not always imply reader awareness. An editor should know why readers will be pleased or troubled by particular words, styles, or ideas whether or not the reader understands precisely what is leading to feelings of pleasure, enthusiasm, impatience, distaste, or apathy. Outright bad taste, flaunting accepted etiquette, and flagrant impropriety make up only the tip of the wrong-tone iceberg.

Consistency is another permanent goal in editing. This does not mean slavish repetition of a term when synonyms would be equally correct and less boring; it means not changing styles midstream and not allowing internal contradictions (examples: a.m. on page two, am on page seven; referring to six primary objectives and then listing only five). It also pertains to more subtle shifts such as in the apparent author attitude toward any given matter (usually brought about by multiple authors) or in including a year date in a brochure revision and not updating internal references to "last year," even though the original text is two years old and the client said that only the date needed to be altered.

Effect comes from clarity which in turn comes from almost everything previously mentioned, plus a love of brevity and precision in word choice. A clear thought is a thought reduced to its essentials, naked in the light. Qualifications and other necessary trimmings must not be allowed to obscure the thought itself, but should be its loyal servants and admirers.

What is essential? Everything needed to achieve the desired effect, and nothing else. Cutting away nonessentials is the finest favor an editor can do for most manuscripts. If they bleed — that is, lose meaning or impact — the editor has cut improperly.

Cutting should begin on the grandest scale possible, and continue until slight but unmistakable damage is done to the manuscript. Only then should the editor relent, and restore just enough to staunch the bleeding. Editors in the early stages of their careers are usually amazed to see how many first paragraphs can be eliminated, with a few valuable words transferred to the relative safety of the next sentence.

What questions remain uppermost in an editor's mind as sections and paragraphs and sentences and words and parts of words are struck down without remorse? Two favorites spring to mind, beyond the usual interrogation of suspected fluff and redundancies:

A. What is the likelihood that the reader already knows this or would assume it?

B. Is this word (or phrase or sentence or whatever) doing useful work?

Being oblivious to question A. leads writers and editors into danger of committing the single most irritating act in the whole realm of communication — telling people what they already know. Students who have already visited a campus should never intentionally be told where it is located. Prospective donors of large sums should not be told what the current climate is in the financial marketplace. Parents should not be told that an institution makes every effort to help their children become the best they can be.

Hard on the heels of relating ideas already known is the even more common act of telling readers things they may reasonably be assumed to know. The flat statement that an institution is in need of additional funds to carry out its mission comes under this heading, while telling *why* the funds are needed is legitimate. In every instance, how a statement is couched can be more helpful or damaging than the statement itself.

The answer to question B. will allow an energetic editor to make numerous cuts. More fat lurks under the skin of most manuscripts than the author is aware of, and more than the editor can see at first glance. The hard question which must be applied to every part of the writing — every word — is not whether it reads well as it stands, but whether the effect will suffer if the part is eliminated or made simpler (and simpler usually means shorter).

> *As an example of the above, take this sentence: There are many areas in which students may major at Colloidial College as candidates for the Bachelor of Science degree.*

That's pretty bad. Edited, the entire paragraph becomes:

> *For example: Twelve majors lead to the B.S. degree.*

Boiling down the introductory phrase comes almost automatically — no one needs to be told an example is as an example, nor that it refers to what came immediately before it, nor that the reader should take it, nor that what follows qualifies as a sentence. Equally simplistic is the editorial desire to strike down "There are" or "It is" or any other vagueness as the beginning of a sentence.

Less automatic but equally helpful is the substitution of the specific number for "many" and the compression of "areas in which students may major" to "majors." Similarly, making major a plural noun instead of a verb allows "lead to" to take the place of "as candidates for."

Finally, the reasonable assumptions concerning prior reader knowledge: The sentence does not appear to be the opening one in a publication, and the publication is evidently addressed to persons concerned with opportunities in higher education. Thus the reasonable assumptions are that Colloidial College has already been mentioned, probably to excess, as the institution where all that is said applies, and that the reader is aware of the meaning of the common abbreviation for the degree.

The following example of overwriting, taken almost word for word from real-life submissions to undergraduate course catalogs and printed unchanged at some institutions, shows how much material provided in good faith can be eliminated without harm:

> ENGLISH 456 Intermediate Shakespeare
>
> This course will provide students the opportunity to study in depth the works of the early master of English literature. Discussion will encompass six of Shakespeare's tragedies and five of his comedies. Class members will be allowed to present short scenes from one of the plays as in-class readings, minus costumes and makeup, for one additional credit. Available only to those who have taken ENGLISH 268 and receive permission of the instructor.

The edited version:

> ENGLISH 456 Intermediate Shakespeare
>
> Six of the tragedies and five of the comedies; optional short readings in front of class for one added credit. Prerequisites: ENGLISH 268 and consent of instructor.

As an exercise, check each of the deleted words to see whether damage has been done by cutting them. Note that use of the future tense, while common in course *proposals*, should not remain in course descriptions; it implies the course is not yet being taught. Even present tense verbs may be cut. The first sentence in the original adds nothing to the information conveyed by the title. Claiming depth for the study is no substitute for the reader's own simple assessment of how deep it is likely to be, given coverage of eleven plays in a single semester. Finally, who would imagine costumes and makeup would be required for short in-class readings?

Also assumed is a standard course description format and style, enforced alike for all of possibly hundreds of "authors" in scores of departments. Editors who work in an academic climate which does not allow for standardization within a single publication because of lack of editorial authority to alter faculty-issued wording would do well to seek the help of higher academic authority in enforcing such standards. The editor knows this would benefit the institution; the editor thus must convince the dean or provost or other top academic administrator of the fact.

The remaining act of editing not yet discussed is assessing one's own efforts in context. This involves a final reading of the edited manuscript (if time allows) from the standpoint of the readership, which is not the same as that of the author or editor. This act requires the editor to try to become a bright high school junior seeking early admission, or a scientist's colleague in any research field, or a seventy-year-old alumnus whose regret at the passing of the good old days may outweigh the desire to assist the annual fund. To the first, an aardvark might best be an anteater, while the second might accept the label of myrmecophagous mammal, and to the third it might be known (if that were the fact) as the beloved mascot of the Class of '43. The manner of communicating to these three readerships, and to countless others, is by no means interchangeable.

In more subtle ways, practice continually proves that although synonyms may abound, one or two are arguably better suited to any given readership than the others. As hinted at earlier, there is no all-encompassing public. The whole world is truly uninterested in anything you may have to transmit as a link in a college or university communication chain. The more minutely the readership can be subdivided for a given purpose, the finer the wording of the message may be honed, and the greater the probability of the desired impact and response.❦

How Deep the Roots

Ezekiel Brown was known in town
As just a silly youth —
Inert, inane, inept, mundane,
Untoward and uncouth.
Ezekiel Brown moved into town,
And what he earned, he kept.
Soon Brown was bored, but couth and toward
And ert and ane and ept.

— *K. H. W.*

Chapter VII

Overload and How to Avoid It

The stand-up comic who said, "I've got enough money to last me the rest of my life — if I don't buy anything," had a lesson for editors in the remark. We all have enough time to edit everything that's printed at our institutions — as long as we don't spend more than a minute or two on each project.

There's a fine line between hurrying and doing a poor job, and we may all have crossed it at times. This subtle difference is not the topic of this chapter.

The topic is outright overload — not the kind of load which might possibly result in an editor doing less than the best possible job, nor the kind of load that results in nothing worse than a skipped coffee break and twenty minutes overtime.

We are talking about the unmistakable overload which prevents professional performance — having too many jobs for the number of hours before deadlines, and knowing it all too well.

Let's assume — always a pleasant pastime — that you have exhausted the potential of additional editorial staff, a subject which attains exhaustion easily at most colleges. Let's also assume that you and your colleagues have collaborated energetically on scheduling, so that there are as few peaks and valleys of workload on the calendar as possible. What other relief can be arranged?

The workload can be whittled down in two other ways at most institutions: by administrative fiat and by encouraging self-reliance in certain clients.

Administrative fiat involves convincing your boss and boss's boss and possibly others that 1. you have too much work, and 2. there are certain projects and types of projects which your publications office would be better off not handling at all.

It should be easy to prove the workload is excessive, if this is in fact true, by proper record-keeping. The second point is more difficult to sell, but should be explored in the interest of efficiency and logic, as well as in your own self-interest.

Are you now handling certain jobs simply because they arrive at the office and have some relevance to the institution, but which when scrutinized appear to be goats among the sheep? Do any of them seem to be self-serving

to individuals only, and of no benefit to the institution? Do any carry personal funding, other than institutional grants? Are any of them student-generated, while as a general thing your office does not handle student projects? Are any of them for academic use, while your office is concerned only with institutional outreach? Could your superiors be persuaded that your function should extend only to administratively generated publications and those being sent (at least in part) off campus, thereby removing from your workload a large number of jobs which have to do with student events and would be distributed only on campus? Your own situation will suggest other such avenues to explore.

The second method of avoiding overload, encouraging self-reliance on the part of some clients, should also be approached with the consent of the editor's superiors. It involves setting limits on the work the editor will do on specific jobs, such as conference programs, newsletters, and publications of semi-autonomous units which have their own editorial staff.

Does your conference services office routinely handle most programs and associated print jobs, while others come to the central publications office for no apparent reason other than the desire of a conference sponsor or leader to have your office do the work?

How many newsletters are produced on your campus? If no one knows for sure, it's time for a survey, especially if you are being asked to edit some of them. All newsletters produced by campus units have titular editors or compilers, who may or may not feel confident of their publications skills. Those who do not will commonly turn to the institution's publications editor for help.

For many years, the newsletter policy of the Publications Office of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst provided that all possible assistance be given by the central editor to the newsletter editor on the first issue, or, if the newsletter editor was newly named, on the individual's first issue. In both instances, after helping establish format, style, editorial approach, etc., the publications office would cut the cord, and the titular editor would receive further help only with specific queries, a service available to the entire campus community.

Semi-autonomous units with staffs capable of performing their own editing, such as service-oriented centers, the Cooperative Extension Service, and the Division of Continuing Education, have for many years been encouraged to assume total editorial responsibility for materials they publish. Only on request or in matters involving federal regulation or University-wide policy was a working relationship established for the moment between these offices and the University Publications Office.

Other specific areas also excluded from the purview of the University's Publications Office for many years were: manuscripts attributed to individual authors, such as monographs; student-generated work; non-book publications generated by the University of Massachusetts Press, and scholarly journals.

However the pie is sliced, it should be done with the widest possible cooperation and foreknowledge, in a manner that will allow the central editing office to chew comfortably everything it is asked to bite off.❦

Things the Editor Does Not Wish to Hear

When editing is finished, always near the close of day,
The client says, "I'm sending a revision right away."

When rush jobs are delivered, and the sweat has left the brow,
The client adds, "We'll mail them out a week or two from now."

When extra care was taken and all proofs most strictly read,
The client chides, "I saw that typo in the banner head."

When time is tight and you have tallied every second in it,
The client purrs, "Don't worry, this'll only take a minute."

When massive change is forecast, and its need is clearly shown,
The client pleads, "Can't I just give it to you on the phone?"

—*K. H. W.*

Chapter VIII

Nuts and Bolts

(This chapter is an alphabetical compilation of specifics — the minutiae of editing which go beyond generalizations and taken together make up a substantial portion of the craft of publications editing. The philosophy which colors these entries is the author's alone, but may be of help in shaping another's personal approach to editing.

No attempt is made here to duplicate the style and editing advice contained in other readily available and well respected reference works. *Webster's Third International Dictionary* and the *University of Chicago Manual of Style* are the indispensable authorities for countless editors, and have been the bottom-line sources of editorial counsel and decisions for the University of Massachusetts at Amherst's publications program for the past quarter century. The present assemblage presents ideas which embroider or extend information available elsewhere, often with a localized approach or expressing personal opinion.

Because useful information is often hidden under unexpected or creative headings, this potpourri should be read through rather than used as a reference encyclopedia.)

ABBREVIATIONS — Should be used when no sacrifice of information or clarity is involved. When in doubt, spell it out. Do not abbreviate parts of proper names which are not abbreviated by their owners, such as "Chrysler Corp.," nor spell out any which the owners abbreviate, such as "G. & C. Merriam Company."

ABSTRACT — A double-meaning word. First, in the scholarly sense, as verb or noun, it denotes culling the essence from a body of writing or the boiled-down material itself, and should be avoided in favor of summarizing or a summary, except in intentionally scholarly writing. Second, in the general sense, it means the opposite of real or concrete when applied to ideas, and should be avoided both in manuscripts and in editorial approach.

ACCURACY — Editors are responsible for accuracy of *usage* — making sure the right word carries the intended meaning. They are not responsible for the accuracy of *content* specifics, unless by special agreement with lazy or overburdened authors. This does not mean they should not be helpful by pointing out any inaccuracies they encounter.

ADJECTIVAL HYPHENS — Use hyphens between adjective and noun when the two are used together to modify another noun, and not when they do not. Thus: *long-term validity* but *valid over the long term*; an *off-campus apartment*, but an *apartment off campus*. Exceptions: such specific combinations as "high energy physics" and "Five College program" which follow conventions established by a field or organization.

ADVERBIAL HYPHENS — Do not use hyphens between adverbial combinations in which the adverb ends in -ly. Thus: her *slowly rising average*, but a *fast-moving vehicle*. The key is whether misunderstanding is possible, as it might be in "freshly edited manuscript" as opposed to the meaning of "freshly-edited manuscript"— edited in a fresh manner or edited recently or anew. When in doubt, abandon rules and go for clarity.

AMPERSANDS — The & symbol should not be used as shorthand without specific justification. In body copy, as opposed to headings and lists, it is as much out of place in "Arts & Sciences" as it is in "here & there." In headlines, running heads, etc., it is accepted as a means toward brevity as well as a design device. Its sole excuse in full-sentence context within body copy is for clarity of meaning, as in the following, which would become confusing without it to those unaware of the institutional structure: "The departments of Industrial Engineering & Operations Research and Electrical & Computer Engineering," as compared to "the departments of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research and Electrical and Computer Engineering.

AREA CODES — Seven-digit telephone numbers are commonly written with hyphens between the third and fourth number, and thus do not require special editorial sensitivity. Area codes, however, are not treated in anything approaching a uniform manner. For general use, set off area codes by parenthesis: 1 (203) 987-6543, or simply (203) 987-6543. Note that this refers to true *area* codes — those which designate a *geographical* area. For those so-called area codes which designate a special *category of payment* for the telephone service, such as the original 800 numbers or the recent proliferation of 900-series numbers, use hyphens only: 1-900-123-4567.

ASTERISKS — These are best used to identify a subcategory in a list, such as restricted majors within a set of all majors. They are also usable, but subject to misuse, as a reference point marking insertion of extra detail, qualification, or explanation which appears with asterisk as a footnote. In the second case, it is always well to try to fit the asterisked information smoothly and without mental strain on the part of the reader into the body of the text. If this does not work, fine; let the asterisk stand. Asterisks used in indented lists or other non-body type should be repeated and explained after a part-line rule immediately following the list or other visually identifiable type

section. Those used in body copy should be repeated and explained at the bottom of the page or column in which they first appear. Because of their widely accepted meaning as a referent, use of single asterisks as simple dingbats or design devices is discouraged.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES — When references or entries are few, it is possible to avoid bibliographies entirely, incorporating references into the text or appending a simple list entitled "Works Cited." Bibliographies, inherently formal, are the source of much trouble to editors in that their forms vary. The basic style difference is between writing in the humanities and the natural sciences, and the editor should determine which of these categories pertains before enforcing a uniform style on casually prepared bibliographies. Most academic writers have their own style of bibliographical entry, but in support of reasonable institutional unity they should be encouraged to use either of the two most common forms (see *Chicago Manual of Style* for details). Clients should be asked to approve the intended bibliographical style before the bulk of editing is done.

BULLETS — The solid dot centered on the height of a line of type is a recommended cure for numbering a series of thoughts, which is only advisable if the units will be referred to by number elsewhere or in the future. Dashes are a good second choice; alphabetical designation is overly formal in most instances; numbers in this context are least advisable of all.

CAPTIONS — Use somewhat compressed style, and avoid the obvious. Do not say such things as "This photograph shows" because all three thoughts in the phrase are already evident. Discuss with the designer the juxtaposition of illustration and caption to determine need for signposts such as "opposite" and "far right" in the caption itself. Check closely for proper match between illustration and caption, especially if there are many of a similar appearance. Bear in mind the shattering experience of the editor who did not catch the transposition of captions under the photographs of an aging ocean liner and Queen Mary, which were printed (respectively) "The venerable Queen arrived at Southampton last Thursday" and "This old tub put into drydock last week to have her bottom scraped."

CITATIONS — In text, use only what is not otherwise stated. Example: "As Smith's seminal work made clear as early as 1963" should not be followed by "(Smith 1963)" regardless of the style used. Similarly: "Smith demonstrated (1963) the relevance of . . ." is sufficient. Unless the writing is intentionally scholarly or internal citations abound, it is usually better to work them into the text. Doctoral dissertations should resemble doctoral dissertations, and scholarly journal articles should resemble articles usually found in the journal in question; other publications should resemble neither.

CONTENTS — Avoid heading of "Table of Contents"; use "Contents." The fact that it is in tabular form is evident. Check to make certain that the wording in the contents precisely matches the wording of the internal chapter and section headings, including matters of style and punctuation. Exception: if the internal headings are lengthy, the contents list may use the first phrase only or otherwise abbreviate them; care should be taken to retain as exact a repetition of words as possible within space limits. Consider suggesting compression of wordy internal headings instead.

COPYRIGHT — Simply stated, copyright is ownership. The copyright notice (which is printed in the original press run of a publication without the necessity for federal registration in advance) is similar to a "No Trespassing" sign in intent and function: Copyright (date) by (holder). Should you print a copyright notice? The answer depends on whether or not you feel the need for a warning to possible unauthorized users. The notice itself is no more a prevention device than the sign in the woods will prevent trespassing. Its value is in advance notice that you wish to protect your property. Registering the copyright (see *Chicago Manual*) puts legal teeth in any subsequent attempt to recover damages for unauthorized use of the material. Copyright may be held by an individual or institution. If you wish the widest possible use made of the printed work and do not wish to profit from its use by others, there is no reason to want, claim, or register a copyright.

CREDITS — For material included in text, credit may be given at point of mention or in acknowledgments in the front matter. More common in academic publishing by institutional publications offices are credits referring to illustrations or functions associated with the printed piece itself, such as "Photography by . . ." or "Graphic design by . . ." followed by individual or office names. Photographers have a long history of receiving credit; others who work on the many aspects of a publication are increasingly credited in print. Determine an institutional approach to this and attempt to apply it uniformly, with latitude given for different types of publication. Illustration credits may be given adjacent to the specific photo or drawing or grouped together in one place with page references. The former is best if there are many such credits; in any case, consult the designer. Note: The word "courtesy" as in "Photo courtesy of Bolger Archives" should never be used if payment was made for the illustration or if the photographer or illustrator was a paid member of the institution's staff.

DEADLINES — Improperly set, deadlines can extend the time required for processing a publication, rather than shorten it. Suggestion of unreasonably tight deadlines should be resisted at the outset. Attempting to meet overly stringent deadlines can result in imperfect work, oversights, and in many instances the necessity to perform one or more steps over again. Remember

the old adage: "There's never enough time to do it right, but there's always time to do it over."

DEGREES — In abbreviations for academic degrees, use periods and no internal spaces: Ph.D., not PhD or Ph. D. Use care with error-prone degrees such as the L.H.D. (capitalized H) and the LL.D. (capitalized second L but only two periods). Use degree abbreviations after names only in formal writing, not as a matter of course and not if it should be assumed that all individuals listed have earned Ph.D.s. Be consistent: avoid attributing earned degrees to some and not to others (who may in fact possess them) in a single listing or context, simply because only some were included in the manuscript. The abbreviation Dr. before a name is best avoided in higher education publications unless the individual has a medical (including veterinary) degree. If it is desired to show that the individual is not a staff assistant or clerk, such as when noting to whom to write, the title "Professor" or other academic rank is preferred. Unearned degrees such as honoraries, if listed, should be followed by (hon.). When full proper names of degrees are written, capitalize only those words which appear on the degree itself: Bachelor of Science in chemistry, never Bachelor of Chemistry or Bachelor of Science in Chemistry; Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, not Master of Mechanical Engineering. Degrees referred to by level only (Bachelor's, Master's) are capitalized to distinguish meaning. Only "doctorates" can be plural without the apostrophe, as the word is a noun rather than an adjective. (The adjective which parallels the lower two degree levels is Doctoral.)

EMPHASIS — The best way to give emphasis to a thought is in the writing structure. If emphasis must be added, italic type within regular roman body type is a gentle way of doing so, but tends to minimize the visual impression at the same time it differentiates. Boldface type is a stronger method, but may result in a jarring visual difference. Underlining is generally intrusive. When considering anything other than italics for typographic emphasis, consult the designer.

ESTIMATING — For editors as differentiated from production staff, estimating pertains to time rather than money prospects. Be wary of providing guesses as to how long the editorial process will take on a project, either to a client or to others on your office staff, until you have had a detailed look at the manuscript. The number of pages it contains is no indication of the amount of editorial time it may demand.

FOOTNOTES — Material authors believe should be in a footnote is often neatly absorbed into the text. If it is not, several options exist. One or two footnotes per page or column may be referenced in the text and at the bottom of the laid-out material by * or ** preceding the note itself, beneath a short hairline rule. Other symbols ("dingbats") should be used if more dif-

ferentiation is needed, rather than added multiple asterisks. If footnotes are many and run throughout the text, numeration may be best. If this approach would clutter the text pages, consider abandoning footnotes in favor of "Notes" (numbered by chapter if necessary) in their own section at publication's end. The primary reason to use footnotes is to allow the text to flow naturally while at the same time providing needed peripheral detail or comment. Use them sparingly.

FOREWORD — This should not be thought of simply as a few words before the main body of the text; strictly viewed, it is pertinent introductory comment by someone *other than* the author of the text, usually attributed to an individual. (See Introduction and Preface.) Be on guard against phonetic but fuzzy thinkers who provide a Foreward.

INTRODUCTION — Material which begins the text, is necessary to it, and has a direct bearing on it as a whole. It may be best to label this section "Introduction" and present it as a separate unit, but better methods frequently present themselves, such as involving the designer in setting of blocks of text typographically or allowing the text to introduce itself in a pleasing progression. Beware scholarly outline forms in whatever guise when these might decrease impact. (See Preface and Foreword.)

ITALICS — (See Emphasis.) Also used as a differentiating design device, for names following quoted matter set off from body, and in other instances where specialization is needed. Foreign words and abbreviations of them should be printed in italics only if the readership of the publication would not consider them an accepted if added part of the English language, and if the institution does not share the *Chicago Manual* approach of italicizing unfamiliar foreign words but not italicizing scholarly words or abbreviations from Latin. In any case, academic publications usually accept e.g. and i.e. as regular English usage, comparable in treatment to etc. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst has used italics for specialized Latin abbreviations such as op. cit., et seq., and et al. (Check periods in text containing these and others, to show which Latin words are abbreviated and which are complete.)

MARKING COPY — Editing marks and notations should be made neatly but highly visibly on copy which will not be photographically reproduced, and neatly in non-reproducible blue pencil on camera-ready material (or material which was thought to be camera-ready before the editor altered it). All marks should be concise, succinct, and unmistakably located with regard to their application points. Comment which refers to arguable alterations should be followed by a question mark as a courtesy to the author. Standard editorial marks should be used for typesetters and printers; readily understood marks or real English should be used to communicate with authors and clients. If the copy being edited is a computer printout (increasingly common),

small editorial marks such as punctuation should be accompanied by solid ticks in the margin, preferably in color, so that they will not be missed by the person making the corrections on a keyboard for revised printout. Be sure your edited copy is returned with the revised copy or corrected floppy disk in order that the changes may be confirmed. Frequently clients make the suggested editorial changes, missing one or two and adding a few touches which may not fit the manuscript's style or that of the institution, and return only the corrected version without considering the problems their action could entail.

OMISSIONS — Intentional omission from material such as quotations, usually done for the sake of simplicity or brevity, is called an ellipsis. It must be admitted to the reader, not swept under the editorial rug. Such omissions are to be designated carefully, either by closing quotes and reopening them when the original wording is resumed, or by a row of dots, or by enclosing inserted paraphrasing in parenthesis. The first of these three methods is best when the segments of the quoted material are separated from each other by a sizeable insertion of new wording, or when the new wording predominates. The second is the most common when a portion of a desired quotation is presented. The simplest system is to use three dots to denote a simple omission internal to a sentence, and four when the omitted material ends in a period. The three dots may be followed by other punctuation marks surrounding the deleted segment in the original, such as question mark and semicolon. In all cases, the dots are not run together, but have at least an en space between each and between them and the adjacent type.

PET PEEVES — With time, every editor accumulates an assortment of words and phrases that have been frequently encountered and which never fail to give pain — those which are downright wrong and those which are consistently misused or overused to the point of loss of meaning. It is helpful to make a written list of these offenders, adding to it as needed, if only to show innocent clients that one or two of their favorites is on the fatal list and thus convince them that change would be helpful. Reprinting such a list would take many pages; interested readers are directed to the examples of superfluous, weak, overweight, and overworked words and phrases included in Bruce Ross-Larson's *Edit Yourself* and to the following examples of the types of words which give offense to the author of this manual:

— Commonplace and therefore almost accepted grammatical errors such as the "of" in "as of yet," the growing use of nouns as verbs, and errors in precise meaning such as the use of infer for imply or envious for enviable

— Jargon which has crossed the line unnecessarily from a field in which it is accepted into other areas where it is not, such as computerese, medicalese, and legalese

— "On a _____ basis" and "will be ___ing" as simple fillers. Proper use of the former (on a decimal basis, on a solid basis) will cross an editor's desk once or twice a year, while inexcusable uses (on an annual basis instead of annually, on a regular basis instead of regularly) may be encountered daily (never on a daily basis). The latter use of "be" with the gerund has become permissible in radio and TV speech in order to give the listener time for comprehension, but should be avoided in print in favor of the simpler "will ___"

— Overuse of the subjective and reflexive, always a sure-fire way to weaken impact

— Fashionable words which either weaken or muddy meaning, such as "designed" instead of "intended" or "created" or "developed" or "arranged" or any of countless other words carrying more specific meaning. Also routinely overworked in academic circles are "enrich" and "enhance"

— Sophisticated-sounding euphemisms, such as "indicated" for "said" or "notified" for "told"

— Use of "hopefully" as anything except an adverb modifying the pertinent verb, in an attempt to avoid stating who is doing the hoping or trying to imply that the hope is universal

PREFACE — Properly a preliminary section in books, prefaces should be so named in other publications only if they play by the rules: they should contain personal comment by the author, including such items as acknowledgments, permissions, reasons for writing the present work, etc., and should not be part of the work itself. (See Introduction and Foreword.)

PROPER NAMES — The prime rule regarding use of proper names, whether individual, corporate, or institutional, is: spell and capitalize them as their owners do. Jones & Jones, Inc., should never be allowed in print as Jones and Jones, nor for them should the Incorporated ever be spelled out. Certainly, all corporations are incorporated, but if they do not announce the fact in their name, you should not. For individuals, editors should make an honest attempt to determine if Percy W. Hicks uses that or invariably wishes to be known as P. Winterbottom Hicks. Check for hyphens or their absence in apparently double last names, especially those extended by marriage. Titles deserve the same care: avoid imposing "Chairperson" on those who call themselves "Chairman" although they are female, and follow the individual woman's wish regarding use of Miss, Mrs., Ms., or no such title at all. In the same way, some departments have heads while others have chairs or chairmen or chairpersons, and such differences should be strictly observed.

PUNCTUATION — While specifics are in the *Chicago Manual*, a few generalizations may be helpful. Punctuation is a code telling the reader how to read in three ways — by pauses of varying length or intensity, by inflection, or by influence on meaning. Avoid overpunctuation, especially unneeded commas setting off beginning phrases which would not be set off by commas if they appeared later in the sentence: "Last Tuesday, all the mid-year exams were given" needs no comma, any more than does "All the mid-year exams were given last Tuesday. " In general, commas indicate a tiny pause. Progressively longer pauses are requested by semicolons, periods, and paragraphs. A sharp break is shown by the dash, and a tying-together by the hyphen, one of several reasons why the two should not be allowed to have the same length in print (the typist's double hyphen is the typesetter's em-dash). A double break within a sentence for insertion of subordinated material as opposed to emphasized wording is set off by parentheses. Exclamation points (seldom needed) and question marks are inflection guides; meaning is aided by such shorthand as a colon for "to wit" or "as follows," an apostrophe to show possession, or brackets to label editorial insertions.

QUERIES — Questions from editor to client should be brief, should be made marginally on the editing copy (unless it is camera-ready, in which case stick-on notes are allowable), and their reference point precisely noted. Such queries should contain just enough information to pose the problem to the client's mind and if possible suggest a solution, and should never attempt humor or sermonizing. Resist the temptation to flag a glaring error with "Huh?" or " ! ! ! ???" unless a firm and forgiving relationship between editor and client already exists.

QUOTATIONS — Unless you are absolutely certain of the quoted material, look it up if it is a common reference, or make sure the client has approval of the person quoted to use the wording provided. Never allow paraphrasing to be enclosed in quotation marks, although it is permitted to quote that portion of a statement that *is* exact: The dean said she disapproved of faculty conduct "tending toward collegial fragmentation" and "academic anarchy." Normal use of quotation marks may be abandoned for design reasons, such as printing obvious quotations with attribution to their authors in a typeface differing from the body type, or when the quotation mark would precede a display-size initial letter.

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS — Apparent self-consciousness in a manuscript, sometimes trying to appear as introspection but only succeeding in looking like literary belly-button lint, is always a prime candidate for cutting. If the author's voice is generally absent throughout, it should not be allowed to appear suddenly in a single instance. The royal collective "we" and "our" in reference to academic units and institutions should be used sparingly, and if

used at all should be consistent. Also best avoided is discussion of the work within the work itself: "The next section describes in more detail . . .," unless the editorial tone is intended to approach that of a doctoral dissertation ("In the following section I will show . . . ."). If possible, find other solutions to reader guidance than the naked signpost approach: "already treated in the previous chapter" or "less explicit than the approach taken here." These would be more acceptable: "as already explained" and "a less explicit approach," although the manuscript would probably be improved by cutting them altogether.

SLASH — Also called the solidus or virgule, the slash becomes intolerable to precise minds in its common use as a cover-up for imprecision or ignorance or as a means to cast a wider net over several possible meanings. Particularly fuzzy is the use of "and/or" when "or" alone would convey the exact meaning desired; if more is required, "A or B or both" is better. Challenge the intent of each slash, and ban its use as shorthand for "and" as in "President/Chancellor."

SPECIAL TREATMENT — At any institution, one or two matters such as the use of the institutional name and the use of the ultimate comma before "and" in a series are the subject of special localized treatment. At the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, for example, it has been the practice to avoid repetition of the word "Massachusetts" such as in "University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts," even in block format as part of cover wording. In addresses, run in or in block format, MA is used as an abbreviation for Massachusetts only if the ZIP code numbers follow the two-letter Postal Service abbreviation (of which they form a part); otherwise, standard state abbreviation (Mass.) is used. For use other than in addresses, the name has been "University of Massachusetts at Amherst," with capitalization optional only for design purposes (in headings or other display type). Unacceptable forms include: "University of Massachusetts, Amherst," "University of Massachusetts/Amherst," "University of Massachusetts-Amherst," and "University of Massachusetts in Amherst." When it is desired to shorten, the term "the University" is proper for second and subsequent mention, as is "here" or "on campus," depending on context specificity. Abbreviation to UMass is proper only for informal use such as student-authored or student-oriented material, exact quotations, and sports contexts. UMASS in all capitals is an error except as the pre-number Hegis designation for a few University-wide courses. UMAS is a proper acronym for a specific academic program only. The abbreviation UM/A is acceptable in University-wide context which also treats of the University of Massachusetts at Boston or Worcester, especially when used as a column heading in tabular matter,

or otherwise where space is limited. It is also used in contexts which encompass reference to a number of campuses, such as a listing of eligibilities from the International Programs Office for overseas study opportunities.

STYLE SHEET — For individual manuscripts or a series of manuscripts from the same client, a notepad style sheet compiled as the editing progresses is often helpful, if not required, as an aid to consistency. The sheet or sheets make note of the usage employed in instances where more than one method or style would be correct, such as use of italics for foreign words, abbreviations common to an individual discipline, method used for citations or notes, treatment of headings for tabular matter, or any of a multitude of other variables which could change midway through a manuscript.

SUBHEADS — Subheads may appear in the unedited manuscript, or may be added by the editor (with client consent) or by the editor and designer cooperatively, if the text needs to be broken up either for better understanding or for appearance. Subheads should be as short as possible, and should refer as directly and acutely as possible to what follows them. If only one level of subhead exists, the problem of internal subdivision levels is avoided. In instances of unavoidable wheels within wheels, the editor must be sure of the logical ground and then ensure through consulting with the designer that the number of levels of subhead required can be accommodated, through variations in type style, size, placement, etc., and that each subhead's level is clearly indicated on the manuscript. In all cases, lettering and numbering of levels as in standard outline form should be considered a last resort.

TALKING — The approach to speech is often easier than the approach to writing. For this reason, it may be helpful to an editor or the editor's client to consider what might be *said* rather than what might be written, when faced with the need to create a snappy first sentence, to summarize an involved concept, or to capture the reader's attention. For many, writer's block disappears when the mind considers speech rather than putting words on paper. The writer whose introductory paragraph is the equivalent of fog or mental quicksand can frequently be put on track by an editor's question: "How would you put that idea across on the telephone to a friend if you were pressed for time?" In the same way, clients may be helped by the suggestion that they dictate their first drafts to a tape recorder and then have the result transcribed.

TANGLED WEBS — If a manuscript's idea is difficult to grasp, it is not always because the subject matter is highly intellectual or complicated by its own nature. If a rapid reading does not provide meaning, look closely for fuzzy wording, loose construction, overuse of abstract and subjective ideas, multiple choice conditionals, dependent clauses, euphemisms, academese, and all the other common methods of masking or embroidering an idea until it

becomes completely hidden. Reworking and reweaving ideas until nothing else can possibly be added is not always helpful. This practice has become even more common among authors with the advent of the word processor and personal computer, which make overwriting and run-on sentences almost effortless.

UNDERSTANDING — Always a two-way street, understanding should exist between client and editor when they are communicating with each other. Of equal importance, the editor must understand the manuscript on its own merit, whether or not it is beyond the editor's intellectual reach because of specialization, scientific jargon, or any other reason. In such instances, the editor should request an explanation from the client, which almost all are happy to provide. Without such understanding, the editor has abdicated all responsibility to perform professionally, and the client may feel unjustified confidence in the assistance the editor is presumed to be offering.

WHY — The most frequent question from client to editor is: "Why did you change that?" This should not make an editor uncomfortable, as it is usually an honest request for clarification. There are two answers: The patently obvious response that the change was dictated by administrative policy, the accepted style book, or the evolution of events, and the less defensible but still legitimate response that it simply seemed necessary (or an improvement) to the editorial eye. The fact that the change had more to do with grace, aptness, tone, or feeling than with accuracy of spelling or truth does not detract from its value. Editors should be not only ready but eager to explain their subjective decisions, as well as their objective ones. If the change does not strike the client as an improvement, a compromise can generally be found among synonyms.❦

Appendix

"When troubled by acute distress, and other remedies have failed, consider the Appendix." — Hippocrates (apocryphal)

Appendix I
Helpful Books

(The author has found these books helpful enough to keep handy over the years. Although some are aimed at writers, all contain material useful to editors. All should be available at college and university bookstores. The list, except for the first four or five, is not in order of importance.)

Any extensive modern dictionary, such as *Webster's Third International Dictionary.*

The Chicago Manual of Style by the University of Chicago Press, 13th Edition — 1982. (With luck, the 14th Edition will appear a decade or so later.) A most thorough, complete, and widely respected book, accepted as the primary authority on style and usage at most educational institutions.

The Elements of Style by Strunk and White, Macmillan, NY —1979. The classic booklet on basic English usage; the shortest of the great books on the topic.

The MLA Handbook by the Modern Language Association, NY —1980. Subtitled "for writers of research papers, theses, and dissertations," the book should be consulted with caution for other purposes, but throws strong light on academic style.

The Elements of Editing by Arthur Plotnik, Macmillan, NY —1982. A broad and perceptive view of the profession by a respected practitioner.

Writing with Precision by Jefferson Bates, Acropolis Books, Washington, DC — 1988. A good handbook on avoiding misunderstandings in published words.

How to Look Good on Paper by Haller Schwartz, Perigree Books (Putnam), NY — 1979. A short book on the basics of effective business communication in print.

Edit Yourself by Bruce Ross-Larson, W. W. Norton & Company, NY — 1982. A treasure trove of examples of editing cuts, changes, and approaches. Something for everyone.

On Writing Well by William Zinsser, Harper & Row, NY, 3rd Edition — 1988. Expansive but helpful book on crafting nonfiction.

Words into Type by Marjorie E. Skillin, Prentice-Hall, NJ, 3rd Edition — 1974. All the basics in depth, plus forays into what goes before and after editing.

Clear Technical Writing by John Brogan, McGraw-Hill, NY —1973. A no-nonsense guide to more powerful and concise technical writing.

Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage by William and Mary Morris, Harper & Row, NY — 1975. An excellent reference work, backed up by a large panel of consultants.

Your own favorite philosophical books about editing and writing, by such doyens as John Simon and Jacques Barzun.

As many thesauruses and books of quotations as your institution can afford to purchase for your office.

Finally, by memorizing a telephone number, immediate access to all the reference works in your institution's library.❦

Appendix II
A Letter That Could Be Better

(The following letter was sent to all faculty members at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst a few years ago over the signatures of four executives of a well known and respected computer manufacturer. The original, with only the names of the firm and product deleted, is printed below; the letter with editing added and the retyped result appear on the next two pages.)

The Original

Dear UMASS Faculty Member:

XXX Co. recently announced its next generation in personal computing, the XXX ### System. This is an entirely new family of products designed to meet your immediate needs and support your long term goals.

Utilizing new micro channel architecture, and advanced integrated system functions, the XXX models provide significant price performance enhancements in both stand alone and connected environments. There is also compatibility with our existing personal computers.

In addition, the video subsystems built into the ### support four new displays that provide screen images that are sharp, steady and highly detailed. New printers were also introduced to compliment these announcements.

All of these new products are part of the existing Massachusetts Education Consortium and Five College contracts and, most, are offered at a 40% discount.

In order to acquaint you with the XXX ### products, we will be holding a ### Fair at the Campus Center in Room 162-75, lower level, on September xx, xx, and xx, 19xx. We will have equipment and personnel available to answer questions and to demonstrate the various models.

We look forward to seeing you there and trust this session will be highly informative and of great value to you. If we can be of any further assistance, please call us at xxx-xxxx.

Very truly yours,

The Editing

Dear UMASS Faculty Member:

~~XXX Co. recently announced its~~ the next generation in personal computing, The XXX ### System. ~~This is an entirely new family of products~~ designed to meet your immediate needs and support your long term goals.

~~Building~~ Using new micro channel architecture and advanced integrated system functions, the XXX models ~~provide significant price performance enhancements in~~ do more work at lower cost, both stand-alone and connected ~~environments. There is also~~ to other hardware. They are compatible with our existing personal computers.

In addition, ~~the~~ video subsystems built-in ~~to the ### support~~ provide four new displays ~~that provide~~ with screen images ~~that are~~ sharp, steady, and highly detailed. New printers ~~were also~~ introduced to compliment the ~~announcement~~ XXX ### System. All ~~of~~ these new products ~~are part of the~~ may be obtained under existing Massachusetts Education Consortium and Five College contracts and have been most are offered at a 40% discount.

~~In order~~ To acquaint you with the XXX ### products, we will ~~be~~ holding a ### Fair at the Campus Center ~~in~~, Room 162-75, lower level, on September xx, xx, and xx. ~~19xx. We will have equipment and~~ Our personnel ~~available~~ will answer questions and ~~to~~ demonstrate the ~~various models~~ new equipment.

We look forward to ~~seeing~~ meeting you ~~there and trust this~~ at this valuable and informative session. ~~will be highly informative and of great value to you~~. If we can be of any ~~further~~ assistance, meanwhile, please call us at xxx-xxxx.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Final Version

Dear UMASS Faculty Member:

The XXX ###, the next generation in personal computers, is designed to meet your immediate needs and to support your long-term goals.

Using new micro channel architecture and advanced integrated system functions, the ### models do more work at lower cost, both stand-alone and connected to other hardware. They are compatible with our existing personal computers.

In addition, built-in video subsystems provide four new displays, with sharp, steady, and highly detailed screen images. New printers have been introduced to complement the ###.

All these new products may be obtained under existing Massachusetts Higher Education Consortium and Five College contracts, and most are offered at a 40% discount.

To acquaint you with the XXX ### products, we will hold a ### Fair at the Campus Center, Rooms 162-175, lower level, on September xx, xx, and xx, 19xx. Our personnel will answer questions and demonstrate the new equipment.

We look forward to seeing you at this valuable and informative session. If we can be of any assistance meanwhile, please call us at xxx-xxxx.

Very truly yours,

(NOTE: It is not fair to assume the writers would be familiar with University of Massachusetts style specifics; therefore, the version above does not include changes such as replacing UMASS with University of Massachusetts, listing the room before the building, etc.)❦

BEST COPY AVAILABLE